arXiv:math/0303202v3 [math.AP] 2 May 2003

On a class of singularly perturbed elliptic equations in divergence form: existence and multiplicity results

A. Pomponio[*]
SISSA, via Beirut 2/4
I-34014 Trieste
pomponio@sissa.it

S. Secchi[†]
Università di Pisa, via F. Buonarroti 2
I-56127 Pisa
secchi@mail.dm.unipi.it

1 Introduction

The aim of this paper is to study the existence and the concentrating behavior of solutions to the following problem:

$$\begin{cases} -\varepsilon^2 \operatorname{div}\big(J(x)\nabla u\big) + V(x)u = u^p & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \\ u > 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \\ \lim_{|x|\to\infty} u(x) = 0 \end{cases} \tag{1}$$

where $N \geq 3$, $p \in \big(1, \frac{N+2}{N-2}\big)$, $V \colon \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R}$, $J \colon \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R}^{N\times N}$ are C^1 functions. Here the symbol $\mathbb{R}^{N\times N}$ stands for the set of $(N \times N)$ real matrices.

Such a problem, at least in the case $J \equiv I$, where I is the identity matrix in $\mathbb{R}^{N\times N}$, arises naturally when seeking *standing waves* of the nonlinear

---

[*] Supported by MIUR, national project *Variational methods and nonlinear differential equations*

[†] Supported by MIUR, national project *Variational methods and nonlinear differential equations*

Schrödinger equation with bounded potential V, that are solutions of the form

$$\psi(t,x) = \mathrm{e}^{i\hbar^{-1}t}u(x)$$

of the following problem

$$i\hbar\frac{\partial\psi}{\partial t} = -\hbar^2\Delta\psi + V(x)\psi - |\psi|^{p-1}\psi, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^N,$$

where $\hbar$ denotes the Planck constant, i is the unit imaginary. The usual strategy is to put $\varepsilon = \hbar$ and then to study what happens when $\varepsilon \to 0$.

Problem (1), at least with $J \equiv I$, has been studied extensively in several works, see e.g. [2, 11, 12, 14, 15, 19, 22, 23, 25, 29, 30].

It is known that if (1) has a solution concentrating at some z_0, then $\nabla V(z_0) = 0$. Conversely, if z_0 is a critical point of V with some stability properties, then (1) has a solution concentrating at z_0 (see for example [2, 3, 19]).

Two main strategies have been followed. A first one, initiated by Floer and Weinstein [15], relies on a finite dimensional reduction. The second one has been introduced by del Pino and Felmer [11] and is based on a penalization technique jointly with local linking theorems.

In the present paper, we study (1) in the case $J \not\equiv I$. Our research is motivated by [27], where a general class of singularly perturbed quasilinear equation on $\mathbb{R}^N$,

$$-\varepsilon^2 \operatorname{div}\big(J(x,u)\nabla u\big) + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2}\langle D_s J(x,u)\nabla u \mid \nabla u\rangle + V(x)u = f(u), \tag{2}$$

is studied by means of non-smooth critical points theory. If J depends only on x and $f(u) = u^p$, then (2) becomes (1).

We observe that it is in general impossible to reduce the second-order operator in equation (1) to the standard Laplace operator in the whole $\mathbb{R}^N$ by means of a single change of coordinates. This phenomenon especially appears in high dimension $N > 3$, as already remarked in [9], chapter III.

On V and J we will make the following assumptions:

(V) $V \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^N, \mathbb{R})$ and $\inf_{\mathbb{R}^N} V = \alpha > 0$;

(J) $J \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^N, \mathbb{R}^{N\times N})$, J is bounded; moreover, $J(x)$ is, for each $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$, a symmetric matrix, and

$$(\exists \nu > 0)(\forall x \in \mathbb{R}^N)(\forall \xi \in \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \{0\}) : \ \langle J(x)\xi, \xi\rangle \geq \nu|\xi|^2. \tag{3}$$

Let us introduce an auxiliary function which will play a crucial rôle in the study of (1). Let $\Gamma\colon \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R}$ be a function so defined:

$$\Gamma(z) = V(z)^{\frac{p+1}{p-1} - \frac{N}{2}} \left(\det J(z)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{4}$$

Let us observe that by **(J)**, Γ is well defined.

We now state the main results of this work. We will see that Γ gives, roughly speaking, a sufficient condition and a necessary one to have concentrating solutions around a point.

Theorem 1.1. *Suppose* **(V)** *and* **(J)** *hold. Suppose that there exists a compact domain $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ such that*

$$\min_{\Lambda} \Gamma < \min_{\partial\Lambda} \Gamma.$$

Then, for all $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small, there exists a solution $u_\varepsilon \in H(\mathbb{R}^N) \cap C(\mathbb{R}^N)$ of (1) with $\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} V(x)u^2 dx < +\infty$. This solution has only one global maximum point $x_\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and we have that $\Gamma(x_\varepsilon) \to \min_\Lambda \Gamma$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$ and

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} u_\varepsilon(x) = 0 \quad \textit{for all } x \neq x_\varepsilon.$$

Theorem 1.2. *Assume, in addition to assumptions* **(V)** *and* **(J)**, *that V is bounded from above. Let $\{u_{\varepsilon_j}\}$ be a sequence of solutions of (1) such that for all $\varepsilon > 0$ there exist $\rho > 0$ and $j_0 > 0$ such that for all $j \geq j_0$ and for all points x with $|x - z_0| \geq \varepsilon_j \rho$, there results*

$$u_{\varepsilon_j}(x) \leq \varepsilon.$$

Then z_0 is a critical point of Γ.

Theorem 1.1 and 1.2 are simplified version of, respectively, Theorem 2.7 and 4.1, which hold under weaker assumptions. Indeed we can treat (1) in a more general domain, instead of $\mathbb{R}^N$, and with a more general nonlinearity. More precisely, let us consider:

$$\begin{cases} -\varepsilon^2 \operatorname{div}\big(J(x)\nabla u\big) + V(x)u = f(u) & \text{in } \Omega \\ u > 0 & \text{in } \Omega \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega \end{cases} \tag{5}$$

where Ω is an open domain of $\mathbb{R}^N$, possibly unbounded, and $f\colon \mathbb{R}^+ \to \mathbb{R}$ is a C^1 such that:

(f1) $f(u) = o(u)$ as $u \to 0^+$;

(f2) for some $p \in \left(1, \frac{N+2}{N-2}\right)$ there holds

$$\lim_{u \to +\infty} \frac{f(u)}{u^p} = 0;$$

(f3) for some $\theta \in (2, p+1)$ we have

$$0 < \theta F(u) \leq f(u)u \quad \text{for all } u > 0,$$

where $F(u) = \int_0^u f(t)dt$;

(f4) the function

$$u \in (0, +\infty) \mapsto \frac{f(u)}{u}$$

is increasing.

The proof of Theorem 1.1 is based on the penalization technique used in [11], adapted to our case. See Section 2 and 3.

If z_0 is a common minimum point of V and J, J depends only by x and $f(u) = u^p$, then our result becomes a particular case of Theorem 1.1 of [27]. On the other side, [27] considers the case when V and J have a common minimum point, only.

In Section 4 we prove Theorem 1.2 using a recent version of Pucci–Serrin variational identity (see [10]).

In Section 5 we consider (1) assuming that V and J satisfy, in addition to hypotheses **(V)** and **(J)**:

(V1) $V \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \mathbb{R})$, V and D^2V are bounded;

(J1) $J \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \mathbb{R}^{N \times N})$, J and D^2J are bounded.

Then the following theorem holds.

Theorem 1.3. *Let* **(V-V1)** *and* **(J-J1)** *hold. Then for $\varepsilon > 0$ small, (1) has a solution concentrating in z_0, provided that one of the two following conditions holds:*

(a) z_0 an isolated local strict minimum or maximum of Γ;

(b) z_0 is a non-degenerate critical point of Γ.

The proof of Theorem (1.3) relies on a finite dimensional reduction, precisely on the perturbation technique developed in [1, 2, 3].

The last section is devoted to the proof of some multiplicity results, see Theorem 6.1, 6.8 and 6.9. As before we distinguish between two cases, according to the use of penalization method of [11] or of the perturbation method of [3].

All the results contained in Section 5 and 6 seem to be new and do not appear in [27].

Acknowledgments The authors wish to thank Professor Antonio Ambrosetti for suggesting the problem and for useful discussions. S. S. thanks also SISSA for the kind hospitality.

Notation

- If F is a C^1 map on a Hilbert space H, we denote by $DF(u)$ its Fréchet derivative at $u \in H$.
- For $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^N$, we denote by $\langle x \mid y \rangle$ the ordinary inner product of x and y.
- C denotes a generic positive constant, which may also vary from line to line.
- $o_h(1)$ denotes a function that tends to 0 as $h \to 0$.

2 The ground-energy function Σ

In this section we present a more general version of Theorem 1.1 and we introduce the ground-energy function Σ that has a crucial rôle in the sequel and that, at least when $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^N$ and $f(u) = u^p$, is equal to Γ up to a constant factor.

We work in the weighted space

$$H_V(\Omega) = \left\{ u \in H_0^1(\Omega) \colon \int_\Omega V(x) u^2 dx < +\infty \right\},$$

endowed with the norm

$$\|u\|^2 = \int_\Omega \left(|\nabla u|^2 + V(x) u^2 \right) dx.$$

Our assumptions imply that the functional $I^\varepsilon \colon H_V(\Omega) \to \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$I^\varepsilon(u) = \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2} \int_\Omega \langle J(x) \nabla u \mid \nabla u \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \int_\Omega V(x) |u|^2 - \int_\Omega F(u) \qquad (6)$$

is of class $C^2(\Omega)$. Moreover, (5) is the Euler-Lagrange equation associated to I^ε, so that we will find solutions of (5) as critical points of I^ε.

We define the *ground-energy function* $\Sigma(z)$ as the ground energy associated with

$$-\operatorname{div}\big(J(z)\nabla u\big) + V(z)u = f(u) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N, \tag{7}$$

where $z \in \mathbb{R}^N$ is seen as a (fixed) parameter. More precisely, (7) is associated to the functional defined on $H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$

$$I_z(u) = \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \langle J(z)\nabla u \mid \nabla u\rangle\, dx + \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} V(z)|u|^2 dx - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} F(u)dx. \tag{8}$$

If $\mathcal{N}_z$ is the *Nehari manifold* of (8), that is

$$\mathcal{N}_z = \big\{u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^N) \mid u \neq 0 \text{ and } DI_z(u)[u] = 0\big\}\,,$$

we have by definition

$$\Sigma(z) = \inf_{u \in \mathcal{N}_z} I_z(u). \tag{9}$$

Remark 2.1. *As already said, when $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^N$ and $f(u) = u^p$, we have that there exists a positive constant $C > 0$ such that*

$$\Sigma(z) = C\Gamma(z).$$

Indeed, if U is the unique radial solution in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ of

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta U + U = U^p & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \\ U > 0, \end{cases}$$

then it is easy to see that

$$\Sigma(z) = \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p+1}\right) V(z)^{\frac{p+1}{p-1} - \frac{N}{2}} \left(\det J(z)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} U^{p+1}.$$

It is easy to see that $\mathcal{N}_z \neq \emptyset$ and moreover the following lemma holds.

Lemma 2.2. *For all $u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ such that u is positive on a set of positive measure, there exists a unique maximum $t(u) > 0$ of*

$$\phi \colon t \in (0, +\infty) \mapsto I_z(tu).$$

In particular, $t(u)u \in \mathcal{N}_z$.

Proof Let us observe that if $\phi'(t) = 0$, then

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \langle J(z)\nabla u \mid \nabla u\rangle + V(z)u^2 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{f(tu)u}{t}\, dx$$

and so, by **(f4)**, ϕ has at most one critical value. By **(f1-2)**, $I_z(0) = 0$, $DI_z(0) = 0$ and $D^2 I_z(0)$ is strictly positive-definite in a neighborhood of 0 and so $\phi(t) > 0$ for t small. Moreover, since

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} F(tu) = \int_{\{x\in\mathbb{R}^N \,:\, u(x)>0\}} F(tu),$$

by **(f3)** there results $\phi(t) < 0$ for big t's. $\square$

The following proposition gives us some useful properties of Σ (see also [30]).

Proposition 2.3. *Let the assumptions* **(V)**, **(J)**, **(f1-4)** *hold. Then:*

1. *the map Σ is well-defined and locally lipschitz;*
2. *the partial derivatives, from the left and the right, of Σ exist at every point, and moreover*

$$\left(\frac{\partial \Sigma}{\partial s_i}\right)^l = \sup_{v_s\in S^s}\left[\frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \langle \frac{\partial J}{\partial s_i}\nabla v_s \mid \nabla v_s\rangle + \frac{1}{2}\frac{\partial V}{\partial s_i}\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |v_s|^2\right]$$

$$\left(\frac{\partial \Sigma}{\partial s_i}\right)^r = \inf_{v_s\in S^s}\left[\frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \langle \frac{\partial J}{\partial s_i}\nabla v_s \mid \nabla v_s\rangle + \frac{1}{2}\frac{\partial V}{\partial s_i}\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |v_s|^2\right]$$

where S^s is the set of ground states corresponding to the energy level $\Sigma(s)$.

Proof First of all, the set S^s is non-empty. Indeed, since s is fixed, we can find a matrix $T = T(s) \in \mathrm{GL}(n)$ such that

$$T^t J(s) T = I \quad \text{(the identity matrix of order } n).$$

By the change of variables $x \mapsto Tx$, the equation

$$-\operatorname{div}(J(s)\nabla v) + V(s)v = f(v) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N$$

can be reduced to

$$-\Delta U + V(s)U = f(U) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N. \tag{10}$$

This change of variables rescales the functional I_z by a constant. Since it is well known that equation (10) has a ground state solution, for each $s \in \mathbb{R}^N$, it immediately follows that $S^s \neq \emptyset$.

Let us observe that if $v_t \in \mathcal{N}_t$, since it satisfies

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \langle J(t)\nabla v_t \mid \nabla v_t\rangle + V(t)|v_t|^2 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} f(v_t)v_t \, dx,$$

$v_t > 0$ on a set of positive measure and so we can apply the Lemma 2.2. Therefore, given s, $t \in \mathbb{R}^N$, there exists precisely one positive number $\theta(s,t)$ such that $\theta(s,t)v_t \in \mathcal{N}_s$. By definition, this means that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \langle J(s)\nabla v_t \mid \nabla v_t\rangle + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} V(s)|v_t|^2 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{f(\theta(s,t)v_t)v_t}{\theta(s,t)}.$$

Moreover, $\theta(t,t) = 1$. Collecting these facts, we see that, by the implicit function theorem, θ is differentiable with respect to the first variable. From its very definition, $\theta(s,t)$ is bounded for s and t bounded in $\mathbb{R}^N$. Let us now observe that

$$\begin{aligned} I_s(\theta(s,t)v_t) = \frac{\theta(s,t)^2}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \langle J(s)\nabla v_t \mid \nabla v_t\rangle + \\ + \frac{\theta(s,t)^2}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} V(s)|v_t|^2 - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} F(\theta(s,t)v_t). \end{aligned}$$

The gradient of the function $s \mapsto I_s(\theta(s,t)v_t)$ is thus

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial s} I_s(\theta(s,t)v_t) &= \frac{\theta(s,t)^2}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \langle \nabla J(s)\nabla v_t \mid \nabla v_t\rangle + \frac{\theta(s,t)^2}{2} \nabla V(s) \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |v_t|^2 \\ &+ \theta(s,t)\frac{\partial\theta}{\partial s}\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \langle J(s)\nabla v_t \mid \nabla v_t\rangle + V(s)\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |v_t|^2\right) - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} f(\theta(s,t)v_t)v_t \frac{\partial\theta}{\partial s} \\ &= \frac{\theta(s,t)^2}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \langle \nabla J(s)\nabla v_t \mid \nabla v_t\rangle + \frac{\theta(s,t)^2}{2} \nabla V(s) \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |v_t|^2 \end{aligned}$$

because $\theta(s,t)v_t \in \mathcal{N}_s$. From this representation, the mean value theorem and the local boundedness of θ, it follows that for all $R > 0$ there exists $M > 0$ such that for all s_1 and s_2 with $|s_1| < R$, $|s_2| < R$:

$$|\Sigma(s_1) - \Sigma(s_2)| \leq M|s_1 - s_2|.$$

This proves the first statement. The proof of the second statement can be modeled on the similar results of [30] together with [24]. We omit the details. □

Remark 2.4. *Some uniqueness conditions for the limiting equation appear in [26].*

The next step is the proof of a fundamental equality between the ground state level and the mountain-pass one. This kind of result is well known at least in the case J equal to the identity matrix (see, for example, [25]).

Proposition 2.5.

$$\inf_{\gamma \in \mathcal{P}_z} \max_{0 \le t \le 1} I_z(\gamma(t)) = \inf_{u \in \mathcal{N}_z} I_z(u) = \Sigma(z),$$

where

$$\mathcal{P}_z = \left\{ \gamma \in C\left([0,1], H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)\right) : \gamma(0) = 0 \text{ and } I_z(\gamma(1)) < 0 \right\}.$$

Proof We now show that for all path $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}_z$, there exists $t_0 > 0$ such that $\gamma(t_0) \in \mathcal{N}_z$.

First of all, let us observe that by our assumptions of f, together with the ellipticity of J and the definition of $\alpha = \inf V > 0$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} DI_z(u)[u] &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \langle J(z)\nabla u \mid \nabla u\rangle + V(z)u^2 - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} f(u)u \, dx \\ &\ge \nu \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u|^2 + \alpha \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |u|^2 - c \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |u|^{\theta+1} \\ &\ge \min\{\nu, \alpha\} \|u\|^2_{H^1_0(\Omega)} - c\|u\|_{L^{\theta+1}(\Omega)}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, fix a path $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}_z$ joining 0 to some $v \neq 0$ such that $I_z(v) < 0$. Hence

$$DI_z(\gamma(t))[\gamma(t)] > 0$$

for $t > 0$ small enough. On the other hand, since $v \neq 0$, we have

$$DI_z(v)[v] < 2I_z(v) \le 0.$$

By the intermediate value theorem, there exists $t_0 \in [0,1]$ such that

$$\gamma(t_0) \in \mathcal{N}_z.$$

This shows also that

$$\inf_{\gamma \in \mathcal{P}_z} \max_{0 \le t \le 1} I_z(\gamma(t)) \ge \inf_{u \in \mathcal{N}_z} I_z(u) = \Sigma(z). \tag{11}$$

But equality actually holds in (11). Indeed, by Lemma 2.2,

$$u \in \mathcal{N}_z \quad \text{if and only if} \quad I_z(u) = \max_{\tau \ge 0} I_z(\tau u). \tag{12}$$

It then follows that the mountain-pass level corresponds to the least energy among the energies of all solutions, that is

$$\inf_{\gamma\in\mathcal{P}_z}\max_{0\le t\le 1} I_z(\gamma(t)) = \inf_{u\in\mathcal{N}_z} I_z(u) = \Sigma(z).$$

□

Remark 2.6. *It is shown in [18] that the level of mountain–pass of I_z coincides with the infimum of the energies among all critical points of I_z under less stringent assumptions on f. Anyway, to prove the regularity of Σ we are not able to weaken our set of hypotheses* **(f1–4)**.

Our main result about existence for (5) is the following theorem.

Theorem 2.7. *Suppose* **(V)**, **(J)** *and* **(f1-4)** *hold. Suppose that there exists a compact domain $\Lambda\subset\Omega$ such that*

$$\min_{\Lambda}\Sigma < \min_{\partial\Lambda}\Sigma. \tag{13}$$

Then, for all $\varepsilon>0$ sufficiently small, there exists a solution $u_\varepsilon\in H_V(\Omega)\cap C(\Omega)$ of (5)*. Moreover, this solution has only one global maximum point $x_\varepsilon\in\Lambda$ and we have that $\Sigma(x_\varepsilon)\to\min_\Lambda\Sigma$ as $\varepsilon\to 0$ and*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} u_\varepsilon(x) = 0 \quad \textit{for all } x\ne x_\varepsilon.$$

Remark 2.8. *As noticed in [27], we have that*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}\|u_\varepsilon\| = 0.$$

The next corollary shows that results of [27], at least in the case of our differential operator, are a particular case of Theorem 2.7. More precisely, as said in the introduction, we will prove that if J and V have a local strict minimum in z_0, then z_0 is also a local strict minimum for Σ and so we can apply Theorem 2.7.

Corollary 2.9. *Suppose* **(V)**, **(J)** *and* **(f1-4)** *hold. Suppose that there exist a compact domain $\Lambda\subset\Omega$ and a $z_0\in\Lambda$ which is a minimum point for V and J in Λ and a strict minimum point for V (resp. J), in the sense that*

$$V(z_0) < \min_{\partial\Lambda} V \quad \left(\textit{resp.}\, V(z_0)\le\min_{\partial\Lambda} V\right) \tag{14}$$

and, for all $\xi\in\mathbb{R}^N\setminus\{0\}$ and for all $z\in\partial\Lambda$,

$$\langle J(z_0)\xi \mid \xi\rangle \le \langle J(z)\xi \mid \xi\rangle \quad (\textit{resp.}\, \langle J(z_0)\xi \mid \xi\rangle < \langle J(z)\xi \mid \xi\rangle). \tag{15}$$

Then (13) *holds and hence the conclusion of Theorem 2.7 continues to be true.*

We will prove Theorem 2.7 and Corollary 2.9 in the next section.

3 The penalization scheme

Since the domain Ω is in general unbounded, a direct application of critical point theory does not, as a rule, provide a solution to (5). Although the functional I^ε has a good geometric structure, it does not satisfy the Palais-Smale condition. Thus, as a first step, we replace I^ε with a different functional that satisfies $(\mathrm{PS})_c$ at all levels $c \in \mathbb{R}$, and finally prove that, as ε gets smaller, the critical points of this new functional are actually solutions of (5). This technique was introduced by del Pino and Felmer in [11], and then used by several authors. The main advantage of this scheme is that, unlike the direct application of some *Concentration-Compactness argument* as in [30], we do not have to impose any comparison assumption between the values of Σ at zero (say) and at infinity.

Following the scheme of [11] (see also [27]), we will define a penalization of the functional I^ε, which satisfies the Palais-Smale condition. Let θ be the number given in **(f3)**. Let $\ell > 0$ be the unique value such that $f(\ell)/\ell = \alpha/k$, where α is defined in **(V)** and $k > \theta/(\theta - 2)$.

We penalize the nonlinearity f in the following way. Define $\tilde{f} \colon \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\tilde{f}(u) = \begin{cases} (\alpha/k)u & \text{if } u > \ell \\ f(u) & \text{if } 0 \leq u \leq \ell \\ 0 & \text{if } u < 0. \end{cases}$$

We now define $g \colon \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ as

$$g(x,u) = \begin{cases} \chi_\Lambda(x) f(u) + (1 - \chi_\Lambda(x))\tilde{f}(u) & \text{if } u \geq 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } u < 0 \end{cases}$$

where χ_Λ is the characteristic function of the set Λ, and let G be the primitive of g, that is

$$G(x,u) = \int_0^u g(x,\tau)\,d\tau.$$

By straightforward calculations, assumptions **(f1-4)** imply:

(g1) $g(x,u) = o(u)$ as $u \to 0^+$, uniformly in $x \in \Omega$;

(g2) $\lim_{u \to +\infty} g(x,u)/u^p = 0$ for some $p \in \left(1, \frac{N+2}{N-2}\right)$;

(g3-i) for some $\theta \in (2, p+1)$ we have

$$0 < \theta G(x,u) \leq g(x,u)u \quad \text{for all } x \in \Lambda,\ u > 0;$$

(g3-ii) for some $k > \frac{\theta}{\theta-2}$ there holds

$$0 \le 2G(x,u) \le g(x,u)u \le \frac{1}{k}V(x)u^2 \quad \text{for all } x \notin \Lambda,\ u > 0;$$

(g4) the function $u \mapsto \frac{g(x,u)}{u}$ is increasing for all $x \in \Lambda$.

The penalized functional will be $E^\varepsilon\colon H_V(\Omega) \to \mathbb{R}$, where

$$E^\varepsilon(u) = \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2}\int_\Omega \langle J(x)\nabla u \mid \nabla u\rangle + \frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega V(x)|u|^2 - \int_\Omega G(x,u). \tag{16}$$

Under our assumptions E^ε satisfies the (PS) condition, as we prove in the next lemma.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $\{u_h\}$ be a sequence in $H_V(\Omega)$ such that $E^\varepsilon(u_h) \to c \in \mathbb{R}$ and $DE^\varepsilon(u_h) \to 0$. Then $\{u_h\}$ has a strongly convergent subsequence.*

Proof As first step, we show that $\{u_h\}$ is bounded. Since $E^\varepsilon(u_h) \to c$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\theta}{2}\varepsilon^2\int_\Omega \langle J(x)\nabla u_h \mid \nabla u_h\rangle &+ \frac{\theta}{2}\int_\Omega V(x)|u_h|^2 \\ &\le \int_\Lambda g(x,u_h)u_h + \frac{\theta}{2k}\int_{\Omega\setminus\Lambda} V(x)|u_h|^2 + \theta c + o(1).\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, since $DE^\varepsilon(u_h)[u_h] = o(\|u_h\|)$,

$$\varepsilon^2\int_\Omega \langle J(x)\nabla u_h \mid \nabla u_h\rangle + \int_\Omega V(x)|u_h|^2 \ge \int_\Lambda g(x,u_h)u_h + o(\|u_h\|).$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}\min\left\{\left(\frac{\theta}{2}-1\right)\varepsilon^2, \frac{\theta}{2} - \frac{\theta}{2k} - 1\right\}\int_\Omega \langle J(x)\nabla u_h \mid \nabla u_h\rangle + V(x)|u_h|^2 \\ \le \theta c + o(1) + o(\|u_h\|)\end{aligned}$$

and so the boundedness of $\{u_h\}$ follows from (3).

Up to subsequence, we have that $u_h \to u$ weakly and point-wise almost everywhere in Ω. To show that this convergence is actually strong, it suffices to prove that, for all $\delta > 0$, there exists $R > 0$ such that

$$\limsup_{k\to\infty}\int_{\Omega\setminus B_R} |\nabla u_h|^2 + V(x)|u_h|^2 < \delta.$$

We take $R > 0$ so large that $\Lambda \subset B_{R/2}$. Let $\eta_R \in C^2(\Omega)$ be a function such that, $\eta_R = 0$ in $B_{R/2}$, $\eta_R = 1$ in $\Omega \setminus B_R$, $0 \le \eta_R \le 1$ in Ω and $|\nabla \eta_R| \le C/R$ in Ω. Since $\{u_h\}$ is bounded,

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} DE^\varepsilon(u_h)[\eta_R u_h] = 0.$$

Therefore

$$\int_\Omega \left(\langle J(x)\nabla u_h \mid \nabla u_h\rangle + V(x)|u_h|^2\right)\eta_R + \int_\Omega \langle J(x)\nabla u_h \mid \nabla \eta_R\rangle\, u_h =$$
$$\int_\Omega g(x,u_h)u_h\eta_R + o(1) \le \frac{1}{k}\int_\Omega V(x)u_h^2\eta_R + o(1),$$

and so

$$\int_{\Omega\setminus B_R} |\nabla u_h|^2 + V(x)u_h^2 \le \frac{C}{R}\|u_h\|_{L^2}\|\nabla u_h\|_{L^2} + o(1).$$

We conclude the proof by letting $R \to +\infty$. □

Since by Proposition 2.3 we know that Σ is a continuous function, we can assume without loss of generality that there exists $z_0 \in \Lambda$ such that

$$\Sigma(z_0) = \min_\Lambda \Sigma.$$

Hence the main assumption of the Theorem 2.7 can be stated as

$$\Sigma(z_0) < \min_{\partial\Lambda} \Sigma.$$

To save notation, we will write I_0 instead of I_{z_0}.

Let us set

$$\bar{c} = \inf_{\gamma\in\mathcal{P}_0}\max_{t\in[0,1]} I_0(\gamma(t)) = \Sigma(z_0),$$

where

$$\mathcal{P}_0 = \left\{\gamma \in C\left([0,1], H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)\right) : \gamma(0) = 0 \text{ and } I_0(\gamma(1)) < 0\right\}.$$

Lemma 3.2. *For all ε sufficiently small, there exists a critical point $u_\varepsilon \in H_V(\Omega)$ of E^ε such that*

$$E^\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon) \le \varepsilon^N \bar{c} + o(\varepsilon^N).$$

Proof We already know that E^ε satisfies the (PS) condition at any level. By a standard minimax argument over the set of paths

$$\mathcal{P}_\varepsilon = \left\{\gamma \in C\left([0,1], H_V(\Omega)\right) : \gamma(0) = 0 \text{ and } E^\varepsilon(\gamma(1)) < 0\right\},$$

we can find a critical point u_ε such that

$$E^\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon) = \inf_{\gamma \in \mathcal{P}_\varepsilon} \max_{t \in [0,1]} E^\varepsilon(\gamma(t)).$$

Since $\bar{c}$ is a *mountain-pass level* of I_0, for all $\delta > 0$ there exists a path $\gamma \colon [0,1] \to H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ such that

$$\bar{c} \leq \max_{0 \leq t \leq 1} I_0(\gamma(t)) \leq \bar{c} + \delta, \quad \gamma(0) = 0, \quad I_0(\gamma(1)) < 0.$$

Let $\zeta \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^N)$ be a cut-off function such that $\zeta = 1$ in a neighborhood of z_0. Define a path in $H_V(\Omega)$ by

$$\Gamma_\varepsilon(\tau) \colon x \mapsto \zeta(x)\gamma(\tau)\left(\frac{x - z_0}{\varepsilon}\right).$$

By direct computation,

$$E^\varepsilon(\Gamma_\varepsilon(\tau)) = \varepsilon^N \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \langle J(z_0)\nabla\gamma(\tau) \mid \nabla\gamma(\tau)\rangle + \right.$$
$$\left. + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} V(z_0)|\gamma(\tau)|^2 - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} F(\gamma(\tau)(\cdot)) \right\} + o(\varepsilon^N),$$

that is

$$E^\varepsilon(\Gamma_\varepsilon(\tau)) = \varepsilon^N I_0(\gamma(\tau)) + o(\varepsilon^N)$$

as $\varepsilon \to 0$. But $\Gamma_\varepsilon \in \mathcal{P}_\varepsilon$, so that

$$\begin{aligned} E^\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon) &= \inf_{\gamma \in \mathcal{P}_\varepsilon} \max_{t \in [0,1]} E^\varepsilon(\gamma(t)) \\ &\leq \max_{t \in [0,1]} E^\varepsilon(\Gamma_\varepsilon(t)) = \varepsilon^N \max_{t \in [0,1]} I_0(\gamma(t)) + o(\varepsilon^N) \\ &\leq \varepsilon^N \bar{c} + \delta\varepsilon^N + o(\varepsilon^N). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\delta > 0$ was arbitrary, the proof is complete. □

Remark 3.3. *By the uniform ellipticity of J and standard regularity theorems (see [17]), the element u_ε actually belongs to $C(\overline{\Lambda})$.*

The next proposition is somehow the key ingredient.

Proposition 3.4. *Let $u_\varepsilon \in H_V(\Omega)$ be the critical point of E^ε found in the previous lemma. Then*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \max_{\partial\Lambda} u_\varepsilon = 0.$$

Moreover, u_ε has only one global maximum point $x_\varepsilon \in \Lambda$ and we have that $\Sigma(x_\varepsilon) \to \min_\Lambda \Sigma$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$ and

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} u_\varepsilon(x) = 0 \quad \textit{for all } x \neq x_\varepsilon.$$

Proof The proof of this Proposition will be performed in several steps. First of all, the following claim implies the Proposition except for the uniqueness of the global maximum.

Claim 1: If $\{\varepsilon_h\}$ is a sequence of positive real numbers converging to zero, and $\{x_h\} \subset \Lambda$ is a sequence of points in Λ such that

$$u_{\varepsilon_h}(x_h) \geq c > 0,$$

then

$$\lim_{h \to \infty} \Sigma(x_h) = \min_\Lambda \Sigma.$$

Indeed, suppose that the statement of the Proposition is false. Then, up to a subsequence, we may suppose that there exists a sequence $\{x_n\} \subset \partial\Lambda$ such that $x_h \to \bar{x} \in \partial\Lambda$ as $\varepsilon_h \to 0$ and $u_{\varepsilon_h}(x_h) \geq c > 0$. Therefore

$$\min_{\partial\Lambda} \Sigma \leq \Sigma(\bar{x}) = \lim_{h \to \infty} \Sigma(x_h) = \min_\Lambda \Sigma,$$

which contradicts our assumptions on Λ. Here we have used the continuity of Σ, already proved. Hence we should just prove the Claim 1. By compactness, we assume without loss of generality that $x_h \to \hat{x} \in \Lambda$. We proceed by contradiction, assuming therefore that

$$\Sigma(\hat{x}) > \min_\Lambda \Sigma.$$

Let $v_h(x) = u_{\varepsilon_h}(x_h + \varepsilon_h x)$. By elliptic regularity, $\{v_h\}$ converges strongly in $H^1(K)$ towards some v, for each compact set $K \subset \mathbb{R}^N$. Let χ be the weak* limit (in L^∞) of the sequence $\{\chi_\Lambda(x_h + \varepsilon_h \cdot)\}_{h \in \mathbb{N}}$. Clearly, $0 \leq \chi \leq 1$. Therefore the function v is a weak solution of the equation

$$-\operatorname{div}(J(\hat{x})\nabla v) + V(\hat{x})v = g_0(\cdot, v) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N,$$

where

$$g_0(x,s) = \chi(x) f(s) + (1 - \chi(x))\, \tilde{f}(s).$$

Let now $E^h : H_V(\Omega_h) \to \mathbb{R}$ be the functional

$$E^h(v) = \frac{1}{2}\int_{\Omega_h} \langle J(x_h + \varepsilon_h x)\nabla v | \nabla v \rangle + \frac{1}{2}\int_{\Omega_h} V(x_h + \varepsilon_h x)v^2 - \int_{\Omega_h} G(x_h + \varepsilon_h x, v),$$

where $\Omega_h = \varepsilon_h^{-1}(\Omega - x_h)$. Let us observe explicitly that

$$E^h(v_h) = \varepsilon_h^{-N} E^{\varepsilon_h}(u_{\varepsilon_h}). \tag{17}$$

It is clear that v_h is a critical point of E^h in $H_V(\Omega_h)$.

As remarked in [13] (see also [27]), v actually satisfies

$$-\operatorname{div}(J(\hat{x})\nabla v) + V(\hat{x})v = f(v) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N. \tag{18}$$

Indeed, without loss of generality, we may suppose that $\chi(x) = \chi_{\{x_1<0\}}(x)$ for all x. Consider the equation satisfied by v:

$$-\operatorname{div}(J(\hat{x})\nabla v) + V(\hat{x})v = \chi_{\{x_1<0\}}(x)f(v) + \chi_{\{x_1>0\}}(x)\tilde{f}(v) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N,$$

and multiply it by $T_k\partial_{x_1}v$, where T_k is a sequence of smooth functions such that $T_k(x) = 1$ if $|x| \leq k$, $T_k(x) = 0$ if $|x| \geq 2k$, and $|\nabla T_k(x)| = O(1/k)$. Hence we get

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \langle J(\hat{x})\nabla v | \nabla(T_k\partial_{x_1}v)\rangle + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} V(\hat{x})vT_k\partial_{x_1}v = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \varphi T_k\partial_{x_1}v,$$

where we have set $\varphi(x,v) = \chi_{\{x_1<0\}}(x)f(v(x)) + \chi_{\{x_1>0\}}(x)\tilde{f}(v(x))$. We observe that $v\partial_{x_1}v = \frac{1}{2}\partial_{x_1}v^2$, so that after an integration by parts we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \langle J(\hat{x})\nabla v | \partial_{x_1}v\nabla T_k\rangle + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \langle J(\hat{x})\nabla v | T_k\partial_{x_1}\nabla v\rangle - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} V(\hat{x})\frac{1}{2}v^2\partial_{x_1}T_k = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \varphi T_k\partial_{x_1}v.$$

By a second integration by parts on the term $\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \langle J(\hat{x})\nabla v | T_k\partial_{x_1}\nabla v\rangle$, and by the Dominated Convergence Theorem, we pass to the limit as $k \to +\infty$ to get

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \varphi(x,v)\partial_{x_1}v = 0.$$

This implies easily that $v(0,x_2,\dots,x_N) \leq \ell$ for all $(x_2,\dots,x_N) \in \mathbb{R}^{N-1}$. It is now easy to check that we can choose

$$\max\{v(\cdot) - \ell, 0\}$$

as a barrier for the equation satisfied by v, and thus prove that $v \leq \ell$ in $\mathbb{R}^N$. In particular, $\varphi(x,v(x)) = f(v(x))$, so that v is a solution of (18).

Claim 2: there results

$$I_{\hat{x}}(v) \leq \liminf_{h\to\infty} E^h(v_h). \tag{19}$$

Indeed, consider now the function

$$\xi_h(x) = \frac{1}{2}\left\langle J(x_h + \varepsilon_h x)\nabla v_h | \nabla v_h\right\rangle + \frac{1}{2}V(x_h + \varepsilon_h x)v_h^2 = G(x_h + \varepsilon_h x, v_h).$$

We already know that $v_h \to v$ strongly on compact sets. Therefore

$$\lim_{h\to\infty}\int_{B_R}\xi_h = \frac{1}{2}\int_{B_R}\left(\langle J(\hat{x})\nabla v|\nabla v\rangle + V(\hat{x})v^2\right) - \int_{B_R}F(v)$$

for all $R > 0$. But $v \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$, so that

$$I_{\hat{x}}(v) - \frac{1}{2}\int_{B_R}\left(\langle J(\hat{x})\nabla v|\nabla v\rangle + V(\hat{x})v^2\right) + \int_{B_R}F(v) = o(1)$$

as $R \to +\infty$. To show that $I_{\hat{x}}(v) \leq \liminf_{h\to\infty} E^h(v_h)$ it is enough to prove that for all $\delta > 0$ there exists $R > 0$ such that

$$\liminf_{h\to\infty}\int_{\Omega_h\setminus B_R}\xi_h \geq -\delta.$$

We introduce again a cutoff function $\eta_R \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$ such that

$$\eta_R = 0 \quad \text{in } B_{R-1},$$

$$\eta_R = 1 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_R,$$

$$|\nabla\eta_R| \leq C.$$

We test the equation satisfied by v_h against $\eta_R v_h$. After some computations we get

$$\liminf_{h\to\infty}\int_{\Omega_h\setminus B_R}\xi_h \geq -\frac{1}{2}\limsup_{h\to\infty}\Bigg[\int_{B_R\setminus B_{R-1}}\langle J(x_h + \varepsilon_h x)\nabla v_h \mid \nabla(\eta_R v_h)\rangle +$$

$$\int_{B_R\setminus B_{R-1}}V(x_h + \varepsilon_h x)v_h^2\eta_R - \int_{B_R\setminus B_{R-1}}g(x_h + \varepsilon_h x, v_h)\eta_R v_h\Bigg] = o(1)$$

as $R \to +\infty$. This finally proves that $I_{\hat{x}}(v) \leq \liminf_{h\to\infty} E^h(v_h)$ and so Claim 2 holds.

We now complete the first part of the proof. First of all, from Lemma 3.2, (17) and from (19), it follows that

$$I_{\hat{x}}(v) \leq \bar{c} = \inf_{\gamma\in\mathcal{P}_0}\sup_{0\leq t\leq 1} I_0(\gamma(t)).$$

On the other hand, since v is a critical point of $I_{\hat{x}}$, by Proposition 2.5, we have

$$\begin{aligned} I_{\hat{x}}(v) &\geq \inf_{\gamma\in\mathcal{P}_{\hat{x}}} \sup_{0\leq t\leq 1} I_{\hat{x}}(\gamma(t)) \\ &= \inf_{u\in\mathcal{N}_{\hat{x}}} I_{\hat{x}}(u) = \Sigma(\hat{x}) \\ &> \inf_{u\in\mathcal{N}_{z_0}} I_0(u) = \Sigma(z_0) \\ &= \inf_{\gamma\in\mathcal{P}_0} \sup_{0\leq t\leq 1} I_0(\gamma(t)) = \bar{c}. \end{aligned}$$

This contradiction proves Claim 1 and so also the first part of the proof.

As regards the last statements of the proposition, these follow easily from the corresponding properties of solutions in [11]. We just sketch the ideas. Let $\bar{z} = \lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} x_\varepsilon$ and take any critical point u of $I_{\bar{z}}$. By the change of variables $x \mapsto Tx$ introduced in the proof of Proposition 2.3, if v is a solution of equation (10), namely

$$-\Delta v + V(\bar{z})v = f(v) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N,$$

then $u(x) = v(Tx)$. It is well known by [16] that solutions of (10) are radially symmetric and decreasing. In particular, $x = 0$ is a nondegenerate maximum point of u. We are in a position to apply a reasoning similar to that of [11], page 133. □

We can now prove Theorem 2.7.

Proof of Theorem 2.7 By Proposition 3.4, we know that if ε is small enough, then

$$u_\varepsilon(x) < \ell \quad \text{for all } x \in \partial\Lambda.$$

The function $(u_\varepsilon(\cdot) - \ell)^+ = \max\{u_\varepsilon(\cdot) - \ell, 0\}$ belongs to $H_0^1(\Omega)$, so that we can test the equation

$$-\varepsilon^2 \operatorname{div}(J\nabla u_\varepsilon) + V u_\varepsilon = g(\cdot, u_\varepsilon) \quad \text{in } \Omega$$

against it. By the divergence theorem,

$$\varepsilon^2 \int_{\Omega\setminus\Lambda} \langle J\nabla (u_\varepsilon - \ell)^+ \mid \nabla (u_\varepsilon - \ell)^+\rangle + \int_{\Omega\setminus\Lambda} \ell\Phi_\varepsilon (u_\varepsilon - \ell)^+ + \int_{\Omega\setminus\Lambda} \Phi_\varepsilon \left((u_\varepsilon - \ell)^+\right)^2 = 0, \quad (20)$$

where we have set

$$\Phi_\varepsilon(x) = V(x) - \frac{g(x, u_\varepsilon(x))}{u_\varepsilon(x)}.$$

The properties of g imply that $\Phi_\varepsilon > 0$ in $\Omega \setminus \Lambda$. Therefore all the terms in (20) must vanish, and in particular

$$u_\varepsilon \leq \ell \quad \text{in } \Omega \setminus \Lambda.$$

We conclude that u_ε, for ε small enough, is actually a critical point of I^ε, and hence a solution of (5). The regularity of u_ε follows again from [17]. The last statement of the theorem follows immediately by Proposition 3.4. $\square$

Proof of Corollary 2.9 First of all, we remark that, for any $u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^N) \setminus \{0\}$ and any fixed $z \in \partial\Lambda$, there results

$$I_z(u) > I_{z_0}(u),$$

because of (14) and (15). We claim that there exists a ground state v_z such that

$$I_z(v_z) = \inf_{u \in \mathcal{N}_z} I_z(u). \tag{21}$$

Indeed, the usual change of variables $x \mapsto Tx$ rescales the functional I_z by a constant factor $|\det T| > 0$. This reduces the search of a ground state for I_z to the search of a ground state for the equation

$$-\mathit{\Delta} v + V(z)v = f(v) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N,$$

whose existence follows easily from the results contained in [5] and [7]. This proves the claim.

Let $z \in \partial\Lambda$ and v_z as in (21). By Lemma 2.2 we know that there exists a positive constant τ such that $\tau v_z \in \mathcal{N}_{z_0}$. By our assumptions and (12), we easily get

$$\Sigma(z) = I_z(v_z) \geq I_z(\tau v_z) > I_{z_0}(\tau v_z) = \max_{t>0} I_{z_0}\left(t(\tau v_z)\right) \geq \Sigma(z_0).$$

Therefore $\Sigma(z_0) < \Sigma(z)$ and so (13) holds. $\square$

4 Necessary condition for concentration

In this section we want to show that the function Σ also plays a *necessary* rôle for the existence of concentrating solutions of (5). We will give also a more general version of Theorem 1.2.

We suppose that $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^N$. Indeed, if Ω has a boundary, we do not expect that solutions must concentrate at critical points of Σ, but rather on critical point of some function connected to the geometry of $\partial\Omega$, see for example [21].

Theorem 4.1. *Assume, in addition to assumptions* **(V)**, **(J)**, **(f1-4)**, *that* V *is bounded from above, and* $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^N$. *Let* $\{u_{\varepsilon_j}\}$ *be a sequence of solutions of* (5) *such that for all* $\varepsilon > 0$ *there exist* $\rho > 0$ *and* $j_0 > 0$ *such that for all* $j \geq j_0$ *and for all points* x *with* $|x - z_0| \geq \varepsilon_j \rho$, *there results*

$$u_{\varepsilon_j}(x) \leq \varepsilon.$$

If, for all $z \in \mathbb{R}^N$, *the functional* I_z *has only one positive ground-state (up to translations), then* z_0 *is a critical point of* Σ.

Before proving the theorem, we recall a recent version of Pucci–Serrin variational identity for lipschitz continuous solutions of a general class of Euler equations (see [10]).

Theorem 4.2. *Let* $\mathcal{L}\colon \mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R}$ *be a* C^1 *function such that the function* $\xi \mapsto \mathcal{L}(x, s, \xi)$ *is strictly convex for every* $(x, s) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}$. *Let* $\varphi \in L^\infty_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^N)$. *Let* $u\colon \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R}$ *be a locally Lipschitz weak solution of*

$$-\operatorname{div}\left(\partial_\xi \mathcal{L}(x, u, \nabla u)\right) + \partial_s \mathcal{L}(x, u, \nabla u) = \varphi \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N.$$

Then

$$\sum_{i,\,k=1}^N \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \partial_i h^k \partial_{\xi_i} \mathcal{L}(x, u, \nabla u) \partial_k u \\ - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \big[(\operatorname{div} h) \mathcal{L}(x, u, \nabla u) + h \cdot \partial_x \mathcal{L}(x, u, \nabla u) \big] = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (h \cdot \nabla u) \varphi,$$

for all $h \in C^1_{\mathrm{c}}\left(\mathbb{R}^N, \mathbb{R}^N\right)$.

Proof of Theorem 4.1 To save notation, we write u_j instead of u_{ε_j}. Define $w_j(x) = u_j(z_0 + \varepsilon_j x)$. Therefore

$$-\operatorname{div}\left(J(z_0 + \varepsilon_j x) \nabla w_j\right) + V(z_0 + \varepsilon_j x) w_j - f(w_j) = 0. \tag{22}$$

By assumption, w_j decays to zero uniformly with respect to $j \in \mathbb{N}$. It is not difficult to build an exponential barrier for w_j, proving in this way that w_j decays to zero exponentially fast at infinity. By elliptic regularity (see [17]), the sequence $\{w_j\}$ converges in C^2_{loc} to a solution w_0 of the equation

$$-\operatorname{div}\left(J(z_0) \nabla w_0\right) + V(z_0) w_0 - f(w_0) = 0.$$

Let us apply Theorem 4.2 to (22), with

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}(x,s,\xi) &= \frac{1}{2}\langle J(z_0+\varepsilon_j x)\xi \mid \xi\rangle + \frac{1}{2}V(z_0+\varepsilon_j x)s^2 - F(s),\\
h(x) &= (T(\varepsilon x), 0, \dots, 0),\\
\varphi(x) &= 0,
\end{aligned}$$

where $T \in C^1_{\mathrm{c}}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ such that $T(x)=1$ if $|x|\le 1$ and $T(x)=0$ if $|x|\ge 2$.

By Theorem 4.2, we have:[1]

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{i=1}^{N}\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \varepsilon\partial_i T(\varepsilon x)\langle J_i(z_0+\varepsilon_j x) \mid \nabla w_j\rangle \partial_1 w_j\\
&-\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \varepsilon\partial_1 T(\varepsilon x)\left[\frac{1}{2}\langle J(z_0+\varepsilon_j x)\nabla w_j \mid \nabla w_j\rangle + \frac{1}{2}V(z_0+\varepsilon_j x)w_j^2 - F(w_j)\right]\\
&\quad -\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \varepsilon T(\varepsilon x)\left[\frac{1}{2}\langle \partial_1 J(z_0+\varepsilon_j x)\nabla w_j \mid \nabla w_j\rangle + \frac{1}{2}\partial_1 V(z_0+\varepsilon_j x)w_j^2\right] = 0
\end{aligned}$$

Passing to the limit in the previous relations, as $\varepsilon \to 0$, we get:

$$\frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left(\langle \partial_1 J(z_0)\nabla w_0 \mid \nabla w_0\rangle + \partial_1 V(z_0)|w_0|^2\right) = 0.$$

The proof is complete once we recall that if S^{z_0} consists of just one element, then, by Proposition 2.3, $\partial_1\Sigma(z_0)=0$. The proof for the other partial derivatives is identical. ☐

Remark 4.3. *Let us observe that Theorem 1.2 is an immediate consequence of Theorem 4.1. Indeed by [7] we know that the problem* (1) *with frozen coefficients has only one positive ground-state (up to translations).*

5 Existence via perturbation method

We have seen in the previous sections that the penalization technique of del Pino and Felmer provides at least a solution of (5) if the auxiliary map Σ possesses a minimum. Moreover, we could also treat the case of maximum point of Σ under some more restrictive, global, assumptions on the potentials J and V. In the present section we show that for (1) it is possible to find at least a solution just by differential methods if there exists a local maximum or minimum of Σ. More precisely, we will apply the perturbation technique in critical point theory as developed in [3]. Since this approach deals with the local behavior of the potentials J and V, we need a better knowledge about the derivatives of the potentials.

---

[1] We denote by $J_i(x)$ the i–th row of $J(x)$.

In addition to hypotheses **(V)** and **(J)**, in this section we will always assume:

(V1) $V \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \mathbb{R})$, V and D^2V are bounded;

(J1) $J \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^N, \mathbb{R}^{N\times N})$, J and D^2J are bounded.

Since we follow closely [3], we will skip some proof and we will give only the sketch of some others.

Without loss of generality we can assume that $V(0) = 1$. Moreover, using the change of variables introduced in the proof of Proposition 2.3, we can assume also $J(0) = I$, where I is the identity matrix of order $N \times N$.

Performing the change of variable $x \mapsto \varepsilon x$, equation

$$-\varepsilon^2 \operatorname{div}\big(J(x)\nabla u\big) + V(x)u = u^p \quad \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^N$$

becomes

$$-\operatorname{div}\left(J(\varepsilon x)\nabla u\right) + V(\varepsilon x)u = u^p \quad \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^N. \tag{23}$$

Solutions of (23) are the critical points $u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ of

$$f_\varepsilon(u) = f_0(u) + \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \langle (J(\varepsilon x) - I))\nabla u \mid \nabla u\rangle dx + \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left(V(\varepsilon x) - 1\right) u^2 dx,$$

where

$$f_0(u) = \frac{1}{2}\|u\|^2 - \frac{1}{p+1}\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u^{p+1} dx,$$

and $\|u\|^2 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u|^2 + u^2$. The solutions of (23) will be found near a solution of

$$-\operatorname{div}\left(J(\varepsilon\xi)\nabla u\right) + V(\varepsilon\xi)u = u^p, \tag{24}$$

for an appropriate choice of $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^N$.

The solutions of (24) are critical points of the functional

$$F^{\varepsilon\xi}(u) = f_0(u) + \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \langle (J(\varepsilon\xi) - I)\nabla u \mid \nabla u\rangle + \frac{1}{2}\left(V(\varepsilon\xi) - 1\right)\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u^2 dx \tag{25}$$

and can be found explicitly. First of all, by the usual change of variables, $x \mapsto T(\varepsilon\xi)$, equation (23) becomes

$$-\Delta v + V(\varepsilon\xi)v = v^p.$$

Let U denote the unique, positive, radial solution of

$$-\Delta u + u = u^p, \qquad u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^N). \tag{26}$$

Then a straight calculation shows that $\alpha U(\beta T x)$ solves (23) whenever

$$\alpha = \alpha(\varepsilon\xi) = [V(\varepsilon\xi)]^{1/(p-1)}, \quad \beta = \beta(\varepsilon\xi) = [V(\varepsilon\xi)]^{1/2} \quad \text{and} \quad T = T(\varepsilon\xi).$$

We set

$$z^{\varepsilon\xi}(x) = \alpha(\varepsilon\xi) U\big(\beta(\varepsilon\xi) T(\varepsilon\xi) x\big) \tag{27}$$

and

$$Z^\varepsilon = \{z^{\varepsilon\xi}(x-\xi) : \xi \in \mathbb{R}^N\}.$$

When there is no possible misunderstanding, we will write z, resp. Z, instead of $z^{\varepsilon\xi}$, resp Z^ε. We will also use the notation z_ξ to denote the function $z_\xi(x) := z^{\varepsilon\xi}(x-\xi)$. Obviously all the functions in $z_\xi \in Z$ are solutions of (24) or, equivalently, critical points of $F^{\varepsilon\xi}$.

Remark 5.1. *Before we proceed, a remark is in order concerning the definition of the manifold Z^ε. Indeed, there is a lot of freedom in the choice of the diagonalizing matrix T. Moreover, Z^ε should be a regular manifold. We claim that, thanks to the uniform ellipticity assumption on J, see* **(J)***, it is possible to choose $T(\varepsilon\xi)$ with the same regularity as J itself. We will not supply a complete proof of this fact. However, the best way to convince oneselves of this is to remember the celebrated Householder algorithm that diagonalises a symmetric matrix J by means of arithmetic operations on the rows and the columns of J. We refer to [28] for an explanation of the method. Each of these operations corresponds to an orthogonal change of variables which preserves the uniform ellipticity of J, and at each step the only possible lack of regularity can be due to the division by an entry on the main diagonal of J. By* **(J)***, each such entry is a function of $\varepsilon\xi$ strictly bounded away from zero, so that it cannot introduce any singularity in the algorithm. A repeated application of this argument can now applied to prove the regularity of T.*

For future references let us point out some estimates. First of all, by straightforward calculations, we get:

$$\partial_\xi z^{\varepsilon\xi}(x-\xi) = -\partial_x z^{\varepsilon\xi}(x-\xi) + O(\varepsilon). \tag{28}$$

Moreover, using **(J1)** and **(V1)**, we can infer that $\nabla f_\varepsilon(z_\xi)$ is close to zero when ε is small. Indeed we have:

$$\|\nabla f_\varepsilon(z_\xi)\| \le C\left(\varepsilon|DJ(\varepsilon\xi)| + \varepsilon|\nabla V(\varepsilon\xi)| + \varepsilon^2\right), \quad C>0. \tag{29}$$

In the next lemma we will show that $D^2 f_\varepsilon$ is invertible on $\big(T_{z_\xi} Z^\varepsilon\big)^\perp$, where $T_{z_\xi} Z^\varepsilon$ denotes the tangent space to Z^ε at z_ξ.

Let $L_{\varepsilon,\xi} : (T_{z_\xi} Z^\varepsilon)^\perp \to (T_{z_\xi} Z^\varepsilon)^\perp$ denote the operator defined by setting $(L_{\varepsilon,\xi} v|w) = D^2 f_\varepsilon(z_\xi)[v, w]$.

Lemma 5.2. *Given $\overline{\xi} > 0$ there exists $C > 0$ such that for ε small enough one has that*

$$|(L_{\varepsilon,\xi} v|v)| \geq C\|v\|^2, \qquad \forall\, |\xi| \leq \overline{\xi},\ \forall\, v \in (T_{z_\xi} Z^\varepsilon)^\perp. \tag{30}$$

Proof We recall that $T_{z_\xi} Z^\varepsilon = \mathrm{span}\{\partial_{\xi_1} z_\xi, \dots, \partial_{\xi_N} z_\xi\}$. Let $\mathcal{V} = \mathrm{span}\{z_\xi, \partial_{x_1} z_\xi, \dots, \partial_{x_N} z_\xi\}$, by (28) it suffices to prove (30) for all $v \in \mathrm{span}\{z_\xi, \phi\}$, where ϕ is orthogonal to $\mathcal{V}$. Precisely we shall prove that there exist $C_1, C_2 > 0$ such that for all $\varepsilon > 0$ small and all $|\xi| \leq \overline{\xi}$ one has:

$$\begin{aligned} (L_{\varepsilon,\xi} z_\xi | z_\xi) &\leq -C_1 < 0. & (31)\\ (L_{\varepsilon,\xi} \phi|\phi) &\geq C_2\|\phi\|^2. & (32) \end{aligned}$$

The proof of (31) follows easily from the fact that z_ξ is a Mountain Pass critical point of $F^{\varepsilon\xi}$ and so from the fact that, given $\overline{\xi}$, there exists $c_0 > 0$ such that for all $\varepsilon > 0$ small and all $|\xi| \leq \overline{\xi}$ one finds:

$$D^2 F^{\varepsilon\xi}(z_\xi)[z_\xi, z_\xi] < -c_0 < 0.$$

Let us prove (32). As before, the fact that z_ξ is a Mountain Pass critical point of $F^{\varepsilon\xi}$ implies that

$$D^2 F^{\varepsilon\xi}(z_\xi)[\phi, \phi] > c_1\|\phi\|^2 \quad \forall \phi \perp \mathcal{V}. \tag{33}$$

Let $R \gg 1$ and consider a radial smooth function $\chi_1 : \mathbb{R}^N \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\chi_1(x) = 1, \quad \text{for } |x| \leq R; \qquad \chi_1(x) = 0, \quad \text{for } |x| \geq 2R;$$

$$|\nabla \chi_1(x)| \leq \frac{2}{R}, \quad \text{for } R \leq |x| \leq 2R.$$

We also set $\chi_2(x) = 1 - \chi_1(x)$. Given ϕ let us consider the functions

$$\phi_i(x) = \chi_i(x - \xi)\phi(x), \quad i = 1, 2.$$

Therefore we need to evaluate the three terms in the equation below:

$$(L_{\varepsilon,\xi}\phi|\phi) = (L_{\varepsilon,\xi}\phi_1|\phi_1) + (L_{\varepsilon,\xi}\phi_2|\phi_2) + 2(L_{\varepsilon,\xi}\phi_1|\phi_2).$$

Using (33) and the definition of χ_i, we easily get

$$\begin{array}{rcl}(L_{\varepsilon,\xi}\phi_1|\phi_1) & \geq & \varepsilon c_1\|\phi_1\|^2 - \varepsilon c_2\|\phi\|^2 + o_R(1)\|\phi\|^2, \\ (L_{\varepsilon,\xi}\phi_2|\phi_2) & \geq & c_3\|\phi_2\|^2 + o_R(1)\|\phi\|^2, \\ (L_{\varepsilon,\xi}\phi_1|\phi_2) & \geq & o_R(1)\|\phi\|^2.\end{array}$$

Therefore, since

$$\|\phi\|^2 = \|\phi_1\|^2 + \|\phi_2\|^2 + 2\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \chi_1\chi_2(\phi^2 + |\nabla\phi|^2) + o_R(1)\|\phi\|^2,$$

we get

$$(L_{\varepsilon,\xi}\phi|\phi) \geq c_4\|\phi\|^2 - c_5 R\varepsilon\|\phi\|^2 + o_R(1)\|\phi\|^2.$$

Taking $R = \varepsilon^{-1/2}$, and choosing ε small, (32) follows.

This completes the proof of the lemma. □

We will show that the existence of critical points of f_ε can be reduced to the search of critical points of an auxiliary finite dimensional functional. First of all we will make a Liapunov-Schmidt reduction, and successively we will study the behavior of an auxiliary finite dimensional functional.

Lemma 5.3. *For $\varepsilon > 0$ small and $|\xi| \leq \overline{\xi}$ there exists a unique $w = w(\varepsilon,\xi) \in (T_{z_\xi}Z)^\perp$ such that $\nabla f_\varepsilon(z_\xi + w) \in T_{z_\xi}Z$. Such a $w(\varepsilon,\xi)$ is of class C^2, resp. $C^{1,p-1}$, with respect to ξ, provided that $p \geq 2$, resp. $1 < p < 2$. Moreover, the functional $\Phi_\varepsilon(\xi) = f_\varepsilon(z_\xi + w(\varepsilon,\xi))$ has the same regularity of w and satisfies:*

$$\nabla\Phi_\varepsilon(\xi_0) = 0 \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad \nabla f_\varepsilon\left(z_{\xi_0} + w(\varepsilon,\xi_0)\right) = 0.$$

Proof Let $P = P_{\varepsilon\xi}$ denote the projection onto $(T_{z_\xi}Z)^\perp$. We want to find a solution $w \in (T_{z_\xi}Z)^\perp$ of the equation $P\nabla f_\varepsilon(z_\xi + w) = 0$. One has that $\nabla f_\varepsilon(z + w) = \nabla f_\varepsilon(z) + D^2 f_\varepsilon(z)[w] + R(z,w)$ with $\|R(z,w)\| = o(\|w\|)$, uniformly with respect to $z = z_\xi$, for $|\xi| \leq \overline{\xi}$. Therefore, our equation is:

$$L_{\varepsilon,\xi}w + P\nabla f_\varepsilon(z) + PR(z,w) = 0.$$

According to Lemma 5.2, this is equivalent to

$$w = N_{\varepsilon,\xi}(w), \quad \text{where} \quad N_{\varepsilon,\xi}(w) = -L_{\varepsilon,\xi}\left(P\nabla f_\varepsilon(z) + PR(z,w)\right).$$

By (29) it follows that

$$\|N_{\varepsilon,\xi}(w)\| \leq c_1\left(\varepsilon|DJ(\varepsilon\xi)| + \varepsilon|\nabla V(\varepsilon\xi)| + \varepsilon^2\right) + o(\|w\|). \tag{34}$$

Then one readily checks that $N_{\varepsilon,\xi}$ is a contraction on some ball in $(T_{z_\xi}Z)^\perp$ provided that $\varepsilon > 0$ is small enough and $|\xi| \leq \overline{\xi}$. Then there exists a unique w such that $w = N_{\varepsilon,\xi}(w)$. Let us point out that we cannot use the Implicit Function Theorem to find $w(\varepsilon, \xi)$, because the map $(\varepsilon, u) \mapsto P\nabla f_\varepsilon(u)$ fails to be C^2. However, fixed $\varepsilon > 0$ small, we can apply the Implicit Function Theorem to the map $(\xi, w) \mapsto P\nabla f_\varepsilon(z_\xi + w)$. Then, in particular, the function $w(\varepsilon, \xi)$ turns out to be of class C^1 with respect to ξ. Finally, it is a standard argument, see [1, 2], to check that the critical points of $\Phi_\varepsilon(\xi) = f_\varepsilon(z + w)$ give rise to critical points of f_ε. $\square$

Remark 5.4. *From (34) it immediately follows that:*

$$\|w\| \leq C\left(\varepsilon|DJ(\varepsilon\xi)| + \varepsilon|\nabla V(\varepsilon\xi)| + \varepsilon^2\right), \tag{35}$$

where $C > 0$.

With easy calculations (see Lemma 4 of [3]), we can give an estimate of the derivative $\partial_\xi w$.

Lemma 5.5. *One has that:*

$$\|\partial_\xi w\| \leq c\left(\varepsilon|DJ(\varepsilon\xi)| + \varepsilon|\nabla V(\varepsilon\xi)| + O(\varepsilon^2)\right)^\gamma, \tag{36}$$

with $c > 0$ and $\gamma = \min\{1, p-1\}$.

Now we will use the estimates on w and $\partial_\xi w$ established above to find an expansion of $\nabla\Phi_\varepsilon(\xi)$, where $\Phi_\varepsilon(\xi) = f_\varepsilon(z_\xi + w(\varepsilon, \xi))$. In the sequel, to be short, we will often write z instead of z_ξ and w instead of $w(\varepsilon, \xi)$. It is always understood that ε is taken in such a way that all the results discussed previously hold.

We have:

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi_\varepsilon(\xi) = \frac{1}{2}\|z+w\|^2 + \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \langle (J(\varepsilon x) - I)\,\nabla(z+w) \mid \nabla(z+w)\rangle + \\ \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (V(\varepsilon x) - 1)\,(z+w)^2 - \frac{1}{p+1}\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (z+w)^{p+1}.\end{aligned}$$

Since $-\operatorname{div}(J(\varepsilon\xi)\nabla z) + V(\varepsilon\xi)z = z^p$, we infer that

$$\begin{aligned}\|z\|^2 &= -\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \langle (J(\varepsilon\xi) - I)\,\nabla z \mid \nabla z\rangle - (V(\varepsilon\xi) - 1)\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} z^2 + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} z^{p+1},\\ (z|w) &= -\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \langle (J(\varepsilon\xi) - I)\,\nabla z \mid \nabla w\rangle - (V(\varepsilon\xi) - 1)\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} zw + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} z^p w.\end{aligned}$$

Then we find:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Phi_\varepsilon(\xi) = \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p+1}\right) \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} z^{p+1} + \\
\frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \langle (J(\varepsilon x) - J(\varepsilon\xi))\nabla z \mid \nabla z\rangle + \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} [V(\varepsilon x) - V(\varepsilon\xi)]\, z^2 + \\
\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \langle (J(\varepsilon x) - J(\varepsilon\xi))\nabla z \mid \nabla w\rangle + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} [V(\varepsilon x) - V(\varepsilon\xi)]\, zw + \\
\frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \langle J(\varepsilon x)\nabla w \mid \nabla w\rangle + \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} V(\varepsilon x) w^2 + \\
\frac{1}{2}\|w\|^2 - \frac{1}{p+1}\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left[(z+w)^{p+1} - z^{p+1} - (p+1)z^p w\right].
\end{aligned}
$$

Since $z(x) = \alpha(\varepsilon\xi)U\big(\beta(\varepsilon\xi)T(\varepsilon\xi)x\big)$, see (27), it follows

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} z^{p+1}dx = C_0 V(\varepsilon\xi)^{\frac{p+1}{p-1}-\frac{N}{2}} \left(\det J(\varepsilon\xi)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} = C_0\Gamma(\varepsilon\xi),$$

where $C_0 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} U^{p+1}$ and Γ is the auxiliary function introduced in (4). Letting $C_1 = C_0[1/2 - 1/(p+1)]$ and recalling the estimates (35) and (36) on w and $\nabla_\xi w$, respectively, we readily find:

$$\Phi_\varepsilon(\xi) = C_1\Gamma(\varepsilon\xi) + \rho_\varepsilon(\xi), \tag{37}$$

where $|\rho_\varepsilon(\xi)| \leq \text{const}\,(\varepsilon|DJ(\varepsilon\xi)| + \varepsilon|\nabla V(\varepsilon\xi)| + \varepsilon^2)$ and

$$\nabla\Phi_\varepsilon(\xi) = C_1\varepsilon\nabla\Gamma(\varepsilon\xi) + \varepsilon^{1+\gamma}R_\varepsilon(\xi), \tag{38}$$

where $|R_\varepsilon(\xi)| \leq \text{const}$ and $\gamma = \min\{1, p-1\}$.

Remark 5.6. *We highlight that, as observed in Remark 2.1, $C_1\Gamma = \Sigma$, where Σ is the ground-state function.*

Now we can prove Theorem 1.3 at least in the case (a). The other is an easy consequence of Theorem 6.8.

Proof of Theorem 1.3 Let z_0 be a minimum point of Γ (the other case is similar) and let $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ be a compact neighborhood of z_0 such that

$$\min_{\Lambda}\Gamma < \min_{\partial\Lambda}\Gamma.$$

By (37), it is easy to see that for ε sufficiently small, there results:

$$\min_{\Lambda}\Phi(\cdot/\varepsilon) < \min_{\partial\Lambda}\Phi(\cdot/\varepsilon).$$

Hence, $\Phi(\cdot/\varepsilon)$ possesses a critical point ξ in Λ. By Lemma 5.3 we have that $u_{\varepsilon,\xi} = z^{\xi}(\cdot - \xi/\varepsilon) + w(\varepsilon, \xi)$ is a critical point of f_ε and so a solution of problem (23). Therefore

$$u_{\varepsilon,\xi}(x/\varepsilon) \simeq z^{\xi}\left(\frac{x-\xi}{\varepsilon}\right)$$

is a solution of (1). This ξ converges to some $\bar{\xi}$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$, but by (38) it follows that $\bar{\xi} = z_0$. □

6 Existence of multiple solutions

In this section we will study the problem of the multiplicity of solutions. In the first subsection we will prove that under a more stringent assumption on the function Σ, our problem (5) possesses generically more than one solution. In the second subsection, instead, we will deal with the problem (1) and, as done in Section 5, we will treat also the case of maximum points for Σ.

6.1 Using penalization method

Since our arguments are inspired to those of [8] and [12], we will skip some easy details.

Let $c_0 = \min_{\mathbb{R}^N} \Sigma(z)$. Let $M \subset \Sigma^{-1}(c_0) \cap \Omega$.

We state our main result for multiple solutions.

Theorem 6.1. *Suppose* **(V)**, **(J)**, **(f1-4)**. *Suppose that* M *is compact and let* $\Lambda \subset \Omega$ *be the closure of a bounded neighborhood of* M *such that* $c_0 < \inf_{\partial\Lambda} \Sigma$.

Suppose, in addition, that there exists a point $z_0 \in M$ *such that:*

(V2) $V(z_0) = \min_\Lambda V$*;*

(J2) *the matrix* $J(z) - J(z_0)$ *is positive-definite for all* $z \in \mathbb{R}^N$.

Then there exists $\varepsilon(\Lambda) > 0$ *such that, for any* $\varepsilon < \varepsilon(\Lambda)$, *problem* (5) *has at least* $\operatorname{cat}(M, \Lambda)$ *solutions concentrating at some points of* M. *Here* $\operatorname{cat}(M, \Lambda)$ *denotes the Lusternik-Schnirelman category of* M *with respect to* Λ.

The proof of theorem 6.1 requires some preliminary lemmas. The main ingredient is the following result in abstract critical point theory (see for example [31]).

Theorem 6.2. *Let X be a complete Riemannian manifold of class $C^{1,1}$, and assume that $\phi \in C^1(X)$ is bounded from below. Let*

$$-\infty < \inf_X \phi < a < b < +\infty.$$

Suppose that ϕ satisfies the Palais–Smale condition on the sublevel $\{u \in X \mid \phi(u) \leq b\}$ and that a is not a critical level for ϕ. Then the number of critical points of ϕ in $\phi^a = \{u \in X \mid \phi(u) \leq a\}$ is at least $\operatorname{cat}(\phi^a, \phi^a)$.

We shall apply this theorem to the penalized functional E^ε, introduced in (16), constrained to its Nehari manifold $\mathcal{N}^\varepsilon$, so that it satisfies (PS) and it is bounded from below. The crucial step is therefore to link the topological richness of the sublevels of E^ε with that of M. For this purpose we make use of the following elementary result. For the proof we refer to [4].

Lemma 6.3. *Let H, Ω^+, Ω^- be closed sets with $\Omega^- \subset \Omega^+$; let $\beta \colon H \to \Omega^+$, $\psi \colon \Omega^- \to H$ be two continuous maps such that $\beta \circ \psi$ is homotopically equivalent to the embedding $j \colon \Omega^- \to \Omega^+$. Then* $\operatorname{cat}(H, H) \geq \operatorname{cat}(\Omega^-, \Omega^+)$.

Let $\eta > 0$ be a smooth, non-increasing cut–off function, defined in $[0, +\infty)$, such that $\eta(|x|) = 1$ if $x \in \Lambda$, and $|\eta'| \leq C$ for some $C > 0$. For any $\xi \in M$ let

$$\psi_{\varepsilon,\xi} \colon x \mapsto \eta(|x-\xi|)\, \omega\left(\frac{x-\xi}{\varepsilon}\right),$$

where ω is a positive ground state of the functional I_ξ. Now define $\Phi_\varepsilon \colon M \to \mathcal{N}^\varepsilon$ by

$$\Phi_\varepsilon(\xi) = \theta_\varepsilon \psi_{\varepsilon,\xi},$$

where $\theta_\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}$ is such that $\theta_\varepsilon \psi_{\varepsilon,\xi} \in \mathcal{N}^\varepsilon$. By Lemma 2.2 with minor changes, we infer that there exists such a θ_ε.

Lemma 6.4. *Uniformly in $\xi \in M$ we have*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \varepsilon^{-N} E^\varepsilon(\Phi_\varepsilon(\xi)) = c_0.$$

Proof The proof is similar to the one of Lemma 4.1 in [8], taking into account the monotonicity property **(f4)** of f and the fact that $\xi \in M \subset \Lambda$. □

We now construct a second auxiliary map which proves to be useful for the comparison of the topologies of M and of the sublevels of E^ε.

Let $R > 0$ be such that $\Lambda \subset \{x \in \mathbb{R}^N \colon |x| \leq R\}$. Let $\chi \colon \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R}^N$ be defined by

$$\chi(x) = \begin{cases} x & \text{for } |x| \leq R \\ \frac{Rx}{|x|} & \text{for } |x| > R. \end{cases}$$

Finally, define $\beta\colon \mathcal{N}^\varepsilon \to \mathbb{R}^N$ by

$$\beta(u) = \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \chi \cdot |u|^2}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |u|^2}.$$

As in [8], it is easy to show that $\beta(\Phi_\varepsilon(\xi)) = \xi + o(1)$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$, uniformly with respect to $\xi \in M$.

Let us define a suitable sublevel of E^ε:

$$\tilde{\mathcal{N}^\varepsilon} = \left\{ u \in \mathcal{N}^\varepsilon \colon E^\varepsilon(u) \leq \varepsilon^N (c_0 + o(1)) \right\}.$$

As already stated, we know that E^ε verifies the (PS) condition at all levels.

Lemma 6.5. *Let $\tilde\Lambda$ a sufficiently small homotopically equivalent neighborhood of Λ. For all ε sufficiently small, we get*

$$\beta(\tilde{\mathcal{N}^\varepsilon}) \subset \tilde\Lambda.$$

Proof The proof proceeds by contradiction. If the claim does not hold, then we may find sequences $\{\varepsilon_n\}$, $\{u_n\}$ such that $\varepsilon_n \to 0$, $u_n \in \tilde{\mathcal{N}^{\varepsilon_n}}$ but $\beta(u_n) \notin \tilde\Lambda$. We claim that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \varepsilon_n^{-N} \int\limits_{\Omega\setminus\tilde\Lambda} |u_n|^2 = 0. \tag{39}$$

Indeed, since $u_n \in \mathcal{N}^{\varepsilon_n}$, we have that

$$E^{\varepsilon_n}(u_n) \geq E^{\varepsilon_n}(tu_n)$$

for any $t > 0$. Let us set

$$\tilde{E}_n(v) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\tilde\Lambda} \varepsilon_n^2 \langle J(x)\nabla v \mid \nabla v\rangle + V(x)|v|^2 - \int_{\tilde\Lambda} G(x,v)\, dx.$$

Choose $t_n > 0$ such that

$$\tilde{E}_n(t_n u_n) = \max_{t>0} \tilde{E}_n(tu_n).$$

Since $u_n \in \tilde{\mathcal{N}^{\varepsilon_n}}$ and that fact that

$$\frac{V(x)}{2} u^2 - G(x,u) \geq Cu^2$$

for all $x \in \Omega \setminus \tilde{\Lambda}$ and all $u > 0$, we obtain

$$\tilde{E}_n(t_n u_n) + C t_n^2 \int\limits_{\Omega\setminus\tilde{\Lambda}} |u_n|^2 \leq \varepsilon_n^N (c_0 + o(1)). \tag{40}$$

From our assumptions on V, J and f, since $E^{\varepsilon_n}(u_n) \leq C\varepsilon_n^N$ and $u_n \in \mathcal{N}^{\varepsilon_n}$, we see that

$$\int_\Omega \varepsilon_n^2 |\nabla u_n|^2 + |u_n|^2 \leq C\varepsilon_n^N. \tag{41}$$

Set $v_n \colon x \mapsto t_n u_n(\varepsilon_n x)$. From the definition of t_n it follows

$$\begin{aligned}\int\limits_{\varepsilon_n^{-1}\tilde{\Lambda}} \langle J(\varepsilon_n x)\nabla v_n \mid \nabla v_n\rangle + V(\varepsilon_n x)|v_n|^2 &= \int\limits_{\varepsilon_n^{-1}\tilde{\Lambda}} g(\varepsilon_n x, v_n)v_n \\ &\leq \int\limits_{\varepsilon_n^{-1}\tilde{\Lambda}} C|v_n|^{p+1} + \rho|v_n|^2,\end{aligned}$$

where $\rho > 0$ can be taken arbitrarily small. Now, Sobolev's theorem yields that

$$\int\limits_{\varepsilon_n^{-1}\tilde{\Lambda}} |v_n|^{p+1} \leq C\Big(\int\limits_{\varepsilon_n^{-1}\tilde{\Lambda}} |\nabla v_n|^2 + |v_n|^2\Big)^{\frac{p+1}{2}}$$

and the constant C can be taken the same for all n, since it generally depends only on the geometry of the domain of integration but not on its volume. Combining the two last inequalities, since J and V are bounded below, we find that there exists $\sigma > 0$ such that for all n,

$$\int\limits_{\varepsilon_n^{-1}\tilde{\Lambda}} |v_n|^{p+1} \geq \sigma > 0.$$

Hence

$$t_n^2 \int\limits_{\tilde{\Lambda}} \varepsilon_n^2 |\nabla u_n|^2 + |u_n|^2 \geq \varepsilon_n^N \sigma',$$

with $\sigma' > 0$. Combining this with (41) we see that

$$t_n \geq \sigma'' > 0 \quad \text{for all } n \in \mathbb{N}, \tag{42}$$

with $\sigma'' > 0$. Now, by the definition of t_n, we have that

$$\tilde{E}_n(t_n u_n) \geq \inf_{u\in H^1(\tilde{\Lambda})} \sup_{t>0} \tilde{E}_n(tu) =: b_n. \tag{43}$$

But it follows from [13], Lemma 1.3 with obvious modifications, that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \varepsilon_n^{-N} b_n = c_0,$$

and this, together with (40), (42) and (43), easily implies the validity of Claim (39).

We now proceed to prove Lemma 6.5. Set $v_n \colon x \mapsto u_n(\varepsilon_n x)$. We claim that

$$\sup_{t>0} I_{z_0}(tv_n) \leq c_0 + o(1). \tag{44}$$

To see this, we recall that $\{v_n\}$ is bounded in the H^1 norm. Since

$$\int\limits_{\varepsilon_n^{-1}\Omega} \langle J(\varepsilon_n x)\nabla v_n \mid \nabla v_n\rangle + V(\varepsilon_n x)|v_n|^2 = \int\limits_{\varepsilon_n^{-1}\Omega} g(\varepsilon_n x, v_n)v_n \leq \int\limits_{\varepsilon_n^{-1}\Omega} f(v_n)v_n,$$

similar arguments as those above show that

$$\int\limits_{\varepsilon_n^{-1}\Omega} |v_n|^{p+1} \geq \sigma > 0.$$

Hence, by the first lemma of Concentration–Compactness (see Lemma I.1 in [20]), there is a sequence B_n of balls of radius one such that

$$\int_{B_n} |v_n|^2 \geq \sigma > 0. \tag{45}$$

We now select $t_n > 0$ such that $I_{z_0}(t_n v_n) = \sup_{t>0} I_{z_0}(tv_n)$. Since $\{v_n\}$ is bounded in H^1 norm we get

$$Ct_n^2 - \int\limits_{\varepsilon_n^{-1}\Omega} F(t_n v_n) \geq I_{z_0}(t_n v_n) \geq c_0.$$

But from assumption **(f3)** we see that $F(u) \geq Cu^\theta$, so that

$$t_n^{\theta-2} \int\limits_{\varepsilon_n^{-1}\Omega} |v_n|^\theta \leq C.$$

This and (45) imply that $\{t_n\}$ is bounded. Therefore from (39) we deduce

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \varepsilon_n^{-1}\tilde{\Lambda}} |t_n v_n|^2 = 0. \tag{46}$$

From the properties of z_0 we easily get (here we use **(J1)** to get rid of the contribution of J both inside and outside $\tilde{\Lambda}$)

$$c_0 + o(1) \geq \varepsilon_n^{-N} E^{\varepsilon_n}(t_n u_n) \geq I_{z_0}(t_n v_n) - \frac{t_n^2}{2} \int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \varepsilon_n^{-1}\tilde{\Lambda}} V(z_0)|v_n|^2.$$

and so we get (44).

If we set $w_n = t_n v_n$, we see that $\{w_n\}$ is a minimizing sequence for I_{z_0} constrained to its Nehary manifold $\mathcal{N}_{z_0}$. By a straightforward application of the Ekeland variational principle, we can build a Palais–Smale sequence $\{\tilde{w_n}\}$ of I_{z_0} such that $\tilde{w_n} - w_n \to 0$ strongly in H^1. Thus there exists a sequence of points $\{z_n\}$ such that $\{w_n(\cdot + z_n)\}$ converges strongly to a positive critical point w_∞ of I_{z_0}. Let $\bar{y}_n = \varepsilon_n z_n$. If $\liminf_{n\to\infty} \operatorname{dist}(\bar{y}_n, \Lambda) > 0$ then, since we can take $\tilde{\Lambda}$ sufficiently small, we have also $\liminf_{n\to\infty} \operatorname{dist}(\bar{y}_n, \tilde{\Lambda}) > 0$ and so from (46) we get

$$\begin{aligned} o(1) = \int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \varepsilon_n^{-1}\tilde{\Lambda}} |t_n v_n|^2 = \int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \varepsilon_n^{-1}\tilde{\Lambda}} |w_n|^2 = \\ = \int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \varepsilon_n^{-1}(\tilde{\Lambda} - \bar{y}_n)} |w_n(\cdot + z_n)|^2 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |w_\infty|^2 + o(1), \end{aligned}$$

which contradicts the positivity of w_∞. Hence we may assume that $\bar{y}_n \to \bar{y} \in \Lambda$. But then

$$\beta(u_n) = \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \chi(\varepsilon_n x + \bar{y}_n)|w_n(x+z_n)|^2\,dx}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |w_n(x+z_n)|^2\,dx} \to \bar{y} \in \Lambda,$$

against our (absurd) assumptions $\beta(u_n) \notin \tilde{\Lambda}$. □

Proof of Theorem 6.1 By Lemma 6.4, the map $\xi \mapsto \Phi_\varepsilon(\xi)$ sends M into $\tilde{\mathcal{N}^\varepsilon}$. Moreover, by Lemma 6.5 we know that $\beta(\tilde{\mathcal{N}^\varepsilon}) \subset \tilde{\Lambda}$. Then the map $\xi \mapsto \beta \circ \Phi_\varepsilon(\xi)$ is homotopic to the inclusion $j\colon M \to \tilde{\Lambda}$, for any ε sufficiently small. We now combine Theorem 6.2 with Lemma 6.3 to get that E^ε has at least $\operatorname{cat}(M, \tilde{\Lambda}) = \operatorname{cat}(M, \Lambda)$ critical points on the manifold $\mathcal{N}^\varepsilon$. The verification that each one of these critical points is actually a solutions of (5) follows again from Section 3, once we recall that the main formula in Lemma 3.2 holds true for each one of the critical points just found by definition of $\tilde{\mathcal{N}^\varepsilon}$. This completes the proof. □

6.2 Using perturbation method

Let us introduce a topological invariant related to Conley theory.

Definition 6.6. *Let M be a subset of $\mathbb{R}^N$, $M \neq \emptyset$. The cup long $l(M)$ of M is defined by*

$$l(M) = 1 + \sup\{k \in \mathbb{N} : \exists\, \alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_k \in \check{H}^*(M) \setminus 1,\, \alpha_1 \cup \ldots \cup \alpha_k \neq 0\}.$$

If no such class exists, we set $l(M) = 1$. Here $\check{H}^*(M)$ is the Alexander cohomology of M with real coefficients and $\cup$ denotes the cup product.

Let us recall Theorem 6.4 in Chapter II of [6].

Theorem 6.7. *Let $h \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and let $M \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ be a smooth compact nondegenerate manifold of critical points of h. Let U be a neighborhood of M and let $l \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$. Then, if $\|h - l\|_{C^1(\bar{U})}$ is sufficiently small, the function l possesses at least $l(M)$ critical points in U.*

Let us suppose that Γ has a smooth manifold of critical points M. We say that M is nondegenerate (for Γ) if every $x \in M$ is a nondegenerate critical point of $\Gamma_{|M^\perp}$. The Morse index of M is, by definition, the Morse index of any $x \in M$, as critical point of $\Gamma_{|M^\perp}$.

We now can state our multiplicity result.

Theorem 6.8. *Let* **(V-V1)** *and* **(J-J1)** *hold and suppose Γ has a nondegenerate smooth manifold of critical points M. Then for $\varepsilon > 0$ small, (1) has at least $l(M)$ solutions that concentrate near points of M.*

Proof First of all, we fix $\overline{\xi}$ in such a way that $|x| < \overline{\xi}$ for all $x \in M$. We will apply the finite dimensional procedure with such $\overline{\xi}$ fixed.

In order to use Theorem 6.7, we set $h(\xi) = C_1\Gamma(\xi)$ and $l(\xi) = \Phi_\varepsilon(\xi/\varepsilon)$. Fix a δ-neighborhood M_δ of M such that $M_\delta \subset \{|x| < \overline{\xi}\}$ and the only critical points of Γ in M_δ are those in M. We will take $U = M_\delta$.

By (37) and (38), $\Phi_\varepsilon(\cdot/\varepsilon)$ converges to $C_1\Gamma(\cdot)$ in $C^1(\bar{U})$ and so, by Theorem 6.7 we have at least $l(M)$ critical points of l provided ε sufficiently small. The concentration statement follows as in [3]. $\square$

Clearly, this theorem shows that there is no essential difficulty in dealing with local maxima of Γ instead of minima. Moreover, when we deal with local minima (resp. maxima) of Γ, the preceding results can be improved because the number of positive solutions of (1) can be estimated by means of the category and M does not need to be a manifold.

Theorem 6.9. *Let* **(V-V1)** *and* **(J-J1)** *hold and suppose* Γ *has a compact set* X *where* Γ *achieves a strict local minimum (resp. maximum), in the sense that there exists* $\delta > 0$ *and a* δ*-neighborhood* X_δ *of* X *such that*

$$b := \inf\{\Gamma(x) : x \in \partial X_\delta\} > a := \Gamma_{|X}, \quad (\text{resp. } \sup\{\Gamma(x) : x \in \partial X_\delta\} < a)\,.$$

Then there exists $\varepsilon_\delta > 0$ *such that* (1) *has at least* $\text{cat}(X, X_\delta)$ *solutions that concentrate near points of* X_δ*, provided* $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_\delta)$.

Proof We will treat only the case of minima, being the other one similar. Fix again $\overline{\xi}$ in such a way that X_δ is contained in $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^N : |x| < \overline{\xi}\}$. We set $X^\varepsilon = \{\xi : \varepsilon\xi \in X\}$, $X_\delta^\varepsilon = \{\xi : \varepsilon\xi \in X_\delta\}$ and $Y^\varepsilon = \{\xi \in X_\delta^\varepsilon : \Phi_\varepsilon(\xi) \leq C_1(a+b)/2\}$. By (37) it follows that there exists $\varepsilon_\delta > 0$ such that

$$X^\varepsilon \subset Y^\varepsilon \subset X_\delta^\varepsilon, \tag{47}$$

provided $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_\delta)$. Moreover, if $\xi \in \partial X_\delta^\varepsilon$ then $\Gamma(\varepsilon\xi) \geq b$ and hence

$$\Phi_\varepsilon(\xi) \geq C_1\Gamma(\varepsilon\xi) + o_\varepsilon(1) \geq C_1 b + o_\varepsilon(1).$$

On the other side, if $\xi \in Y^\varepsilon$ then $\Phi_\varepsilon(\xi) \leq C_1(a+b)/2$. Hence, for ε small, Y^ε cannot meet $\partial X_\delta^\varepsilon$ and this readily implies that Y^ε is compact. Then Φ_ε possesses at least $\text{cat}(Y^\varepsilon, X_\delta^\varepsilon)$ critical points in X_δ. Using (47) and the properties of the category one gets

$$\text{cat}(Y^\varepsilon, Y^\varepsilon) \geq \text{cat}(X^\varepsilon, X_\delta^\varepsilon) = \text{cat}(X, X_\delta),$$

and the result follows. □

Remark 6.10. *Let us observe that Theorem 1.3 is a particular case of Theorem 6.9.*

References

[1] A. Ambrosetti, M. Badiale, *Variational perturbative methods and bifurcation of bound states from the essential spectrum*, Proc. Royal Soc. Edinburgh, **128 A**, (1998), 1131–1161.

[2] A. Ambrosetti, M. Badiale, S. Cingolani, *Semiclassical States of Nonlinear Schrödinger Equations*, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal., **140**, (1997), 285–300.

[3] A. Ambrosetti, A. Malchiodi, S. Secchi, *Multiplicity results for some nonlinear Schrödinger equations with potentials*, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal., **159**, (2001), 253–271.

[4] V. Benci, G. Cerami, *The effect of the domain topology on the number of positive solutions of nonlinear elliptic problems*, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal., **114**, (1991), 79–93.

[5] H. Beresticki, P. L. Lions, *Nonlinear scalar field equations I. Existence of a ground state*. Arch. Rational Mech. Anal., **82**, (1983), 313–346.

[6] K. C. Chang, Infinite dimensional Morse theory and multiple solutions problems, Birkhäuser, 1993.

[7] C. C. Chen, C. S. Lin, *Uniqueness of the ground state solutions of* $\Delta u + f(u) = 0$ *in* $\mathbb{R}^N$, $n \geq 3$, Commun. Partial Differ. Equations, **16**, No. 8/9, (1991), 1549–1572.

[8] S. Cingolani, M. Lazzo, *Multiple positive solutions to nonlinear Schrödinger equations with competing potential functions*, Journal of Diff. Eq., **160**, (2000), 118–138.

[9] R. Courant, D. Hilbert. Methods of mathematical physics. Wiley, New York, 1989.

[10] M. Degiovanni, A. Musesti, M. Squassina, *On the regularity of solutions in the Pucci-Serrin identity*, Calc. Var. PDE, in press.

[11] M. del Pino, P. Felmer, *Local mountain passes for semilinear elliptic problems in unbounded domains*, Cal. Var. PDE, **4**, (1996), 121–137.

[12] M. del Pino, P. Felmer, *Semi-classical states for nonlinear Schrödinger equations*, J. Funct. Anal., **149**, No. 1, (1997), 245–265.

[13] M. del Pino, P. Felmer, *Multi-peak bound states for nonlinear Schrödinger equations*, Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré, Anal. Non Linaire, **15**, No. 2, (1998), 127–149.

[14] M. del Pino, P. Felmer, *Semi-classical states of nonlinear Schrödinger equations: a variational reduction method*, Math. Ann., **324**, No. 1, (2002), 1–32.

[15] A. Floer, A. Weinstein, *Nonspreading wave packets for the cubic Schrödinger equation with a bounded potential*, J. Funct. Anal., **69**, (1986), 397–408.

[16] B. Gidas, W. M. Ni, L. Nirenberg, *Symmetry of positive solutions of nonlinear elliptic equations in* $\mathbb{R}^N$, Adv. Math., Suppl. Stud., **7A**, (1981), 369–402.

[17] D. Gilbarg, N. S. Trudinger. Elliptic partial differential equations of second order. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1983.

[18] L. Jeanjean, K. Tanaka, *A remark on least energy solutions in* $\mathbb{R}^N$, Proc. American Math. Soc., in press.

[19] Y.Y. Li, *On a singularly perturbed elliptic equation*, Adv. Diff. Equat., **2**, (1997), 955–980.

[20] P. L. Lions, *The concentration-Compactness principle in the calculus of variation. The locally compact case. Part II.* Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré, Anal. Non Linéaire, **1**, (1984), 223–283.

[21] W. M. Ni, J. Wei, *On the location and profile of spike-layer solutions to singularly perturbed semilinear Dirichlet problems*, Commun. Pure Appl. Math., **48**, No. 7, (1995),731–768.

[22] Y. G. Oh, *Existence of semiclassical bound states of nonlinear Schrödinger equations*, Comm. PDE, **13**, (1988), 1499–1519.

[23] Y. G. Oh, *On positive multi-bump states of nonlinear Schrödinger equation under multiple well potentials*. Comm. Math. Phys., **131**, (1990), 223–253.

[24] P. Rabier, C. A. Stuart, *Exponential decay of the solutions of quasilinear second-order equations and Pohozaev identities*, J. Differential Equations, **165**, (2000), No. 10–12, 199–234.

[25] P. H. Rabinowitz, *On a class of nonlinear Schrödinger equations*, Z. Angew. Math. Phys., **43**, No. 2, 270–291 (1992)

[26] J. Serrin, M. Tang, *Uniqueness of ground states for quasilinear elliptic equations*, Indiana Univ. Math. J., **49**, (2000), 897–923.

[27] M. Squassina, *Spike solutions for a class of singularly perturbed quasilinear elliptic equations*, Nonlinear Anal., in press.

[28] G. Strang. Linear algebra and its applications. Academic Press, 1980.

[29] X. F. Wang, *On concentration of positive bound states of nonlinear Schrödinger equations*, Comm. Math. Phys., **153**, (1993), 229–244.

[30] X. F. Wang, B. Zeng, *On concentration of positive bound states of nonlinear Schrödinger equations with competing potential functions*, SIAM J. Math. Anal., **28**, (1997), 633–655.

[31] M. Willem. Minimax theorems. Birkhäuser, Boston, 1996.